1	Jeffrey H. Reeves (SBN 156648)	
2	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP	
2	4 Park Plaza, Suite 1400	
3	Irvine, California 92614-8557	
	jreeves@gibsondunn.com	
4	(949) 451-3800 (Telephone) (949) 451-4220 (Facsimile)	
5	(949) 431-4220 (Pacsinine)	
6	and	
7	S. Ashlie Beringer (admitted pro hac vice)	
	Joshua A. Jessen (SBN 222831)	
8	Laura M. Sturges (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)	
9	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 1801 California Street, Suite 4200	
	Denver, Colorado 80202	
10	aberinger@gibsondunn.com	
11	(303) 298-5718 (Telephone)	
11	(303) 313-2868 (Facsimile)	
12		
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
15	NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
16	SAN JOSE	DIVISION
17	GRATEFUL DEAD PRODUCTIONS, a	
18	California corporation, CADESTANSA, LLC, a	CASE NO. 06-07727 (JW) (PVT)
19	limited liability company on behalf of CARLOS SANTANA, an individual, JIMMY PAGE, an	DECLARATION OF JOSHUA A. JESSEN
	individual, ROBERT PLANT, an individual,	IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL (1) SUBSTANTIVE
20	JOHN PAUL JONES, an individual, RAYMOND MANZAREK, an individual,	RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST
21	ROBBY KRIEGER, an individual, JOHN DENSMORE, an individual, PEARL	SET OF INTERROGATORIES, AND (2) PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND
22	COURSON, an individual, GEORGE	THINGS
23	MORRISION, an individual, FANTALITY CORP., a Colorado corporation, SONY BMG	Date: June 26, 2007
24	MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, a Delaware	Time: 10:00 a.m. Ctrm: Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull
25	general partnership, BMG MUSIC, a New York partnership, and ARISTA RECORDS, a	
	Delaware LLC,	
26	·	
27	Plaintiffs,	
,	v.	
28	` .	

1 WILLIAM E. SAGAN, an individual, NORTON LLC, a limited liability company, and BILL 2 GRAHAM ARCHIVES LLC, d/b/a 3 WOLFGANG'S VAULT, a limited liability company, 4 Defendants. 5 NORTON LLC, a limited liability company, 6 BILL GRAHAM ARCHIVES LLC, d/b/a WOLFGANG'S VAULT, a limited liability 7 company, and WILLIAM E. SAGAN, an individual, 8 Counterclaimants, 9 10 v. 11 GRATEFUL DEAD PRODUCTIONS, a California corporation, CADESTANSA LLC, a 12 limited liability company on behalf of CARLOS SANTANA, an individual, JIMMY PAGE, an 13 individual, ROBERT PLANT, an individual, JOHN PAUL JONES, an individual, 14 RAYMOND MANZAREK, an individual, 15 ROBBY KRIEGER, an individual, JOHN DENSMORE, an individual, PEARL 16 COURSON, an individual, GEORGE MORRISON, an individual, FANTALITY 17 CORP., a Colorado corporation, SONY BMG 18 MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, a Delaware general partnership, BMG MUSIC, a New York 19 partnership, and ARISTA RECORDS, a Delaware LLC, ROBERT WEIR, an individual, 20 WARNER MUSIC GROUP CORP., a Delaware corporation, RHINO ENTERTAINMENT, its 21 subsidiary, and BRAVADO INTERNATIONAL 22 GROUP, INC., a California corporation, 23 Counterclaim Defendants. 24 25 26 27

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

28

9

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

I, Joshua A. Jessen, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in all courts in the State of California and am admitted to practice before the United States District Court, Northern District of California. I am an associate in the law firm of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP and am one of the attorneys responsible for the representation of the Plaintiffs in this matter. I make this declaration of my own personal knowledge and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the facts stated herein.
- 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the Joint Case Management Statement and [Proposed] Order, which was filed on April 2, 2007.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions, dated May 14, 2007.
- 4. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Request for Production of Documents to Plaintiffs, Set One, dated March 21, 2007.
- 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' First Request for Production of Documents, dated March 21, 2007.
- 6. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, dated March 21, 2007.
- 7. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' First Requests for Admission, dated March 21, 2007.
- 8. Attached hereto as Exhibit 7 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Production of Documents, dated April 23, 2007.
- 9. Attached hereto as Exhibit 8 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions, dated April 23, 2007.
- 10. Attached hereto as Exhibit 9 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Objections to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, dated April 23, 2007.
- 11. Attached hereto as Exhibit 10 is a true and correct copy of a letter I sent to Defendants' counsel on April 27, 2007, requesting that a meet-and-confer conference be held regarding Defendants' discovery responses on April 30, 2007.

- 12. Attached hereto as Exhibit **11** is a true and correct copy of a letter I received from Defendants' counsel on April 30, 2007.
- 13. On April 30, 2007, my colleague (Ashlie Beringer) and I met and conferred telephonically with Defendants' counsel (Rebecca Calkins and Erin Ranahan) for approximately one and a half hours. During that conference, Defendants' counsel expressed their belief that Plaintiffs had served more than 100 interrogatories. Ms. Beringer and I acknowledged that certain of Plaintiffs' interrogatories arguably consisted of more than one interrogatory, but we informed Defendants' counsel that Plaintiffs' interrogatories certainly did not exceed the 100-interrogatory limit. In an effort to understand Defendants' position, however, we asked Defendants' counsel to identify, on an interrogatory-by-interrogatory basis, the total number of interrogatories Defendants believed Plaintiffs had served. Defendants' counsel agreed to do so by the following day, but even before undertaking the exercise promised Plaintiffs' counsel that Defendants' calculation would result in a number higher than 100.
- 14. Attached hereto as Exhibit **12** is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from Defendants' counsel on May 1, 2007. The e-mail contains Defendants' calculations on an interrogatory-by-interrogatory basis of how many interrogatories Defendants believe Plaintiffs have served. In this e-mail, Defendants' counsel contends that Plaintiffs have served 366 interrogatories, including five interrogatories (Interrogatory Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7 and 16) that alone allegedly total 253 separate interrogatories.
- 15. Attached hereto as Exhibit **13** is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to Defendants' counsel on May 1, 2007.
- 16. Attached hereto as Exhibit **14** is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from Defendants' counsel on May 2, 2007.
- 17. Attached hereto as Exhibit **15** is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to Defendants' counsel on May 4, 2007.
- 18. Attached hereto as Exhibit **16** is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from Defendants' counsel on May 8, 2007.

1	19. Attached hereto as Exhibit 17 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
2	Defendants' counsel on May 8, 2007.	
3	20. Attached hereto as Exhibit 18 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from	
4	Defendants' counsel on May 8, 2007.	
5	21. Attached hereto as Exhibit 19 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
6	Defendants' counsel on May 8, 2007.	
7	22. Attached hereto as Exhibit 20 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
8	Defendants' counsel on the morning of May 14, 2007, inquiring into the status of the supplemental	
9	discovery responses Defendants' counsel had promised to serve by May 11, 2007. I also left	
10	Defendants' counsel (Ms. Calkins) a voicemail on this subject during the afternoon of May 14.	
11	23. Attached hereto as Exhibit 21 is a true and correct copy of Defendants' Supplementa	
12	Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Production of Documents, dated May 14, 2007.	
13	24. Attached hereto as Exhibit 22 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
14	Defendants' counsel on May 15, 2007.	
15	25. Attached hereto as Exhibit 23 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
16	Defendants' counsel on May 16, 2007.	
17	26. Attached hereto as Exhibit 24 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
18	Defendants' counsel on May 17, 2007.	
19	27. Attached hereto as Exhibit 25 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from	
20	Defendants' counsel on May 17, 2007.	
21	28. Attached hereto as Exhibit 26 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
22	Defendants' counsel on May 17, 2007.	
23	29. Attached hereto as Exhibit 27 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I received from	
24	Defendants' counsel on May 18, 2007.	
25	30. Attached hereto as Exhibit 28 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail I sent to	
26	Defendants' counsel on May 20, 2007.	
27		

Case 5:06-cv-07727-JW Document 55 Filed 05/22/07 Page 6 of 6

1	31. On May 21, 2007, I met and conferred telephonically with Defendants' counsel (Ms.	
2	Calkins and Ms. Ranahan) for over one and a half hours. During that conference, I explained the	
3	relevance of the disputed document requests to Defendants' counsel and attempted to address their	
4	objections. At one point during the conference, I even sent them an e-mail that I hoped would	
5	obviate their purported objection to the phrase "Plaintiffs' Intellectual Property," a subject we had	
6	discussed during the April 30 conference, as well. I am attaching a true and correct copy of that e-	
7	mail as Exhibit 29. Despite my efforts, however, Defendants' counsel would not agree to produce	
8	documents responsive to any of the 17 disputed requests for production.	
9	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the	
10	foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on May 22, 2007, at Denver,	
11	Colorado.	
12		
13	Joshua A. Jessen	
14	100229762_1.DOC	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	4	